Exhibit 72

Our Leveling Philosophy Leveling Suggestion Tool Org-Specific Guidelines Escalations Additional Resources FAQs

Q: What is the purpose of this site? Why was it created? A: Candidate leveling is one of the most asked about topics across groups that hire non-technical roles. The OR team heard from recruiters that a set of leveling resources would be helpful, so we created this site with input from the Offer Review SVPs, Business Leads, Lead Recruiters and

We hope the resources on this site will reduce the current complexity of leveling processes and promote fairness of outcomes by:

- · Defining Google's leveling philosophy to create structure
- · Developing leveling guidelines to foster consistency
- · Designing a clear escalation path to increase efficiency

It's important to stress these resources aren't new policies or law, but rather a framework for thoughtful discussions on how we level candidates at the time of hire.

A: The resources on this site are intended for recruiters and HRBPs to help us all make consistent and thoughtful leveling decisions for nontechnical candidates. Recruiters can use these resources to inform their conversations with hiring managers, but should not directly share this site with the business. Instead, they can share this doc with hiring managers or Business Leaders who may have questions about leveling.

Q: Where should I send feedback or questions regarding these resources?

A: We're currently piloting the resources and welcome all feedback. Please send questions and comments to sierral@

Q: Why do we need to be more consistent in how we level like-roles globally?

A: When we're consistent in how we initially level like-roles across groups and regions, we foster equity throughout Google, and create a fair and level playing field for perf and promo as well as internal mobility.

Q: Should the candidate's total years of experience (YOE) determine his/her level?

A: While past relevant experience can signal the candidate's level of RRK required for the role, total YOE should never be the determining factor for leveling. A candidate's level should be selected based primarily on the scope of the role, but also take the candidate's strengths - as demonstrated throughout the hiring process - into consideration.

O: How is "relevant experience" defined?

A: Generally, "relevant experience" refers to the candidate's past professional experience that contributes to his/her level of RRK or domain expertise required for the role.

Q: Shouldn't the hiring manager choose the candidate's level?

A: The hiring manager and recruiter should partner to determine the best level for the candidate given the scope of the role and the candidate's strengths, as demonstrated throughout the hiring process.

Q: What should I do if my candidate does not align with the org-specific guidelines?
A: If a candidate falls outside of the proposed guidelines for a particular org, the recruiter should create a leveling rationale that justifies the candidate's proposed level. Please see go/LevelingRationale for details.

Q: How should the candidate's current compensation play into leveling decisions?

A: While compensation can be a helpful signal in understanding the candidate's level at their current employer, current compensation should not determine the candidate's proposed level. Google levels should be selected based primarily on the scope of the role, but also take the candidate's strengths - as demonstrated throughout the hiring process - into consideration.

Q: How do graduate degrees factor into leveling decisions?

A: Please see the post-grad leveling guidelines for details.

Q: What criteria should I consider when leveling an FTC candidate?

A: Leveling for fixed-term hires should be consistent with leveling for full-time hires in the same role. For fixed term employees converting to full-time roles, leveling will be reviewed at the time of conversion, but level changes are not typical for conversions. Tenure as a fixed-term employee will count toward tenure requirements for promotion candidates.

Add files

Comments

Google : Privacy & Terms

Report Abuse | Remove Access | Powered By Google Sites

CONFIDENTIAL GOOG-ROWE-00053761